

[Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC., MARKETING,
SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 19-md-02913-WHO

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE STATEMENT AND
PROPOSED AGENDA**

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-10(d) and the Court’s October 16, 2020 Minute Order (ECF No. 1067), counsel for Defendants Juul Labs, Inc. (“JLI”), Altria,¹ Director Defendants,² E-Liquid Defendants,³ Retailer Defendants,⁴ and Distributor Defendants⁵ (collectively “Defendants”), and Plaintiffs’ Co-Lead Counsel (“Plaintiffs”) (collectively referred to herein as the “Parties”)

¹ “Altria” refers to Altria Group, Inc., and the Altria-affiliated entities named in Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Class Action Complaint and Consolidated Master Complaint (collectively, “Complaints”), *see* ECF Nos. 387, 388.

² “Director Defendants” refers to Messrs. James Monsees, Adam Bowen, Nicholas Pritzker, Hoyoung Huh, and Riaz Valani.

³ “E-Liquid Defendants” refers to Mother Murphy’s Labs, Inc., Alternative Ingredients, Inc., Tobacco Technology, Inc., and Eliquitech, Inc.

⁴ “Retailer Defendants” refers to Chevron Corporation, Circle K Stores, Inc., Speedway LLC, 7-Eleven, Inc., Walmart, and Walgreen Co.

⁵ “Distributor Defendants” refers to McLane Company, Inc., Eby-Brown Company, LLC, and Core-Mark Holding Company, Inc.

respectfully provide this Joint Case Management Statement in advance of the Further Case Management Conference scheduled for November 20, 2020.

I. PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

The conference will proceed via Zoom, and the Parties will not appear in person. Anyone who wishes to attend the conference must log in using the information available at: <https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/judges/orrick-william-h-who/>.

II. ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED BELOW AND PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Status of Case Filings and Dismissals
2. Case Management Matters
3. Rule 26(f) Report
4. Discovery Status
5. ADR Status

III. STATUS OF CASE FILINGS AND DISMISSALS

As of November 18, 2020, 1200 cases are pending in this MDL, naming 83 defendants. A list of these defendants is attached as **Exhibit A**. To date, 1025 personal injury cases and 141 government entity cases (including 103 school districts, 18 counties, 1 city, and 19 tribes) have been filed in this MDL. 89 MDL plaintiffs have voluntarily dismissed their cases (85 personal injury plaintiffs and 4 class plaintiffs); 94 cases have been dismissed without prejudice pursuant to CMO No. 8; and 55 other cases are subject to pending motions to dismiss that have not yet been ruled upon.

There are 270 complaints pending in JCCP 5052, which is assigned to Judge Ann I. Jones of the Los Angeles Superior Court as the Coordination Trial Judge. There are 66 government entity cases, including 64 school districts and 204 personal injury cases brought on behalf of over 2400 individual personal injury plaintiffs. There are 16 defendants named in those JCCP cases.

The Parties are also aware of 14 cases filed by State Attorneys General specifically: California, Illinois, Hawaii, New York, North Carolina, Mississippi, Minnesota, Washington D.C., Arizona, Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Massachusetts, Colorado, and Washington. Plaintiffs'

1 Liaison Counsel continue their outreach to various State Attorneys General to discuss cooperation
2 with this MDL.

3 An update on matters of significance in (including hearings, schedules, deadlines, and trial
4 dates) in Related Actions as defined by the Joint Coordination Order (CMO 9, ECF No. 572 at 1,
5 3), is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

6 **IV. CASE MANAGEMENT MATTERS**

7 **A. Amended Complaints**

8 On November 12, 2020, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Consolidated Class Action
9 Complaint (ECF No. 1035), and Amended Complaints for the following Government Entities:
10 Tucson Unified School District 19-cv-07335 (ECF No. 25); The Livermore Valley Joint Unified
11 School District 19-cv-08176 (ECF No. 21); The School Board of Broward County, Florida 19-cv-
12 08289 (ECF No. 20); The School Board of Escambia County, Florida 20-cv-00459 (ECF No. 36);
13 Three Village Central School District 19-cv-07208 (ECF No. 25); and County of Santa Cruz,
14 Individually And on Behalf of The People of The State of California 20-cv-02261 (ECF No. 29).
15 The Parties have agreed on a proposed briefing schedule for any Rule 12(b)(6) motions in response
16 to these Complaints as follows:

17 Opening Motions: January 4, 2021

18 Opposition Briefs: February 3, 2021

19 Reply Briefs: February 24, 2021

20 **B. Personal Injury Bellwether Selection Issues**

21 On November 9, 2020, the Court entered its Order Regarding (1) Lexecon and Bellwether
22 Selection for Personal Injury Cases and (2) Class Representative Personal Injury Claims. (ECF No.
23 1125.) The Court granted Plaintiffs' request for "leave to amend to change their 'designated forum'
24 under CMO No. 3 to designate the Northern District of California," and gave Plaintiffs "fourteen
25 days from the date of [that] Order to re-designate this forum as their designated forum." (ECF No.
26 1125 at 2-3.) The Court indicated that "[a]ny such re-designated cases will be included in and
27 available for selection as part of the bellwether pool." (*Id.* at 3.) The Parties agree, subject to the
28 Court's approval, to extend the deadline for the Parties' bellwether selections (which were

scheduled for December 15, 2020) by two weeks to December 29, 2020 to provide additional time once the universe of potential bellwether discovery pool candidates has been defined. Under this agreement, the Court's bellwether selection date would remain as scheduled (December 15, 2020).

In addition, the Parties also agree to modest changes in other dates in the scheduling order:

- January 7, 2021: Meet and Confer Deadline as to Deferred Pleading Challenges to the Court's bellwether selections
- January 14, 2021: Meet and Confer Deadline as to Deferred Pleading Challenges to the Parties' bellwether selections
- January 25, 2021: Deadline for Bellwether Plaintiffs to Amend Complaints, if not previously amended
- February 5, 2021: Deadline for Defendants to File Deferred Pleading Challenges

The other dates in the personal injury schedule will not be affected by these modest extensions.

Certain Defendants'⁶ Position:

While the Court adopted Plaintiffs' proposal to allow the amendment of complaints filed in accordance with the Direct Filing Order, Defendants believe this is procedurally improper. Absent an MDL, Plaintiffs could not "amend" their complaints to transfer their cases from one federal district court to another. Instead, Plaintiffs would need to dismiss their complaints in the original jurisdiction and then refile new complaints in the second jurisdiction.⁷ Plaintiffs' "amendments" should be treated as a dismissal of the original action in the jurisdiction identified as the "Designated Forum" and the filing of a new action in the Northern District of California, including for purposes of applying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 41(a)(1)(B).

⁶ The Altria Defendants do not join this section of the CMC Statement and have no issues to report regarding bellwether selection at this time.

⁷ As previously indicated in their respective Memoranda Regarding Bellwether Selection, *Lexecon*, and Jurisdiction (ECF No. 1078, ECF No. 1076), the Retailer Defendants (except for Chevron Corporation), Distributor Defendants, E-Liquid Defendants, and Altria maintain that there is no personal jurisdiction over them in any case filed by a non-California resident in this Court, and will further detail their objections to personal jurisdiction in accordance with the applicable deadline imposed by this Court for deferred pleading challenges. Chevron Corporation maintains that it is not a proper defendant in any current case in which it is named as none involve a gas station Chevron owns or operates, but instead involve independent franchisees who likely will have their own personal jurisdiction and *Lexecon* objections.

Plaintiffs' Position:

Plaintiffs object to Certain Defendants' request for reconsideration of the Court's Order regarding *Lexecon* (ECF No. 1125). There is nothing "procedurally improper" about Plaintiffs amending Short Form Complaints that were filed in the Northern District of California to allege that venue is proper in this district. If there were, Certain Defendants would have raised that point in their supplemental briefing to Plaintiffs' request to amend and provided case law or other authority in support.

C. Government Entity Bellwether Selection Protocol

The Parties have been meeting and conferring regarding the selection of government entity bellwethers. While the parties are making progress, there are still additional details that need to be worked out and would benefit from further discussion. The Parties have reached agreement on the following parameters:

1. The pool of bellwether government entity nominees will consist of 12 government entity plaintiffs, drawn from those government entity plaintiffs with complaints on file by December 21, 2020.
2. Defendants and Plaintiffs will each select 6 government entities, with a mix of counties and school districts, to be included in the pool. These selections will be made and submitted to the Court by January 21, 2020.
3. The Plaintiffs will use their best efforts to have completed fact sheets submitted by December 21, 2020, but a completed fact sheet will not be required for inclusion in the bellwether pool.

The Parties also agree that sequencing and ordering of the bellwethers needs to occur such that not all twelve of the bellwethers are undergoing discovery and expert work up at the same time. The Parties agree that as a general matter, a separation of nine months is appropriate between different groups drawn from the twelve bellwether cases. The Parties are continuing to meet and confer on the process for grouping and sequencing the government entities in the bellwether pool for purposes of trial, and propose reporting to the Court on whether they are able to reach agreement

at the next CMC. The Parties have attached as **Exhibit D** to this CMC an agreed-upon scheduling stipulation reflecting the above dates.

D. Second Amended Class Action Complaint

On November 12, 2020, Plaintiffs filed the Second Amended Class Action Complaint. (“SAC,” ECF No. 1035.) The SAC dropped 29 Class Representatives from the First Amended Class Action Complaint, and added new 21 Class Representatives. (ECF No. 1035-1.) Although the SAC alleges a potential California-law “nationwide” class, Plaintiffs have confirmed that “they do not intend to seek nationwide certification of the claims under California law.” (ECF No. 442 at 9.)

V. 26(F) REPORT

Plaintiffs and Defendants continue Rule 26 discussions. The parties had several meet-and-confer sessions and offer the following report:

A. Initial Disclosures

Plaintiffs and Defendants are continuing to meet and confer regarding supplementing certain Defendants’ Initial Disclosures with the production of insurance policy documents, to the extent applicable, and the Parties continue to discuss the timing and Plaintiffs’ Initial Disclosure Requirements.

B. Changes to Default Discovery Limits

The Parties continue to confer regarding changing the default discovery limits to accommodate the scale and complexity of the litigation.

VI. DISCOVERY STATUS

A. MDL Discovery

On November 17, 2020, the Parties participated in a discovery conference with Judge Corley. A copy of the November 16, 2020 Joint Discovery Status Report provided in advance of that conference is attached as **Exhibit C**. By December 4, 2020, JLI will provide Plaintiffs with a proposed schedule for completing the noticed 30(b)(6) depositions regarding design, marketing, sales, testing, and youth prevention sufficiently in advance of Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification. In the meantime, JLI will block out and provide to Plaintiffs several dates in December

1 for completing topics related to design and will provide proposed dates for depositions of seven
2 current and former JLI employees.

3 **B. Coordination with JCCP on Discovery**

4 The MDL Plaintiffs are holding weekly calls with JCCP counsel regarding discovery
5 coordination. Defendants appreciate and encourage coordination between the MDL and the JCCP,
6 as detailed by the Joint Coordination Order (CMO No. 9, ECF No. 572) and the Deposition Protocol
7 (CMO No. 10, ECF No. 573).

8 **VII. ADR STATUS**

9 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-10(d), the Parties report that they continue to confer with
10 Settlement Master Thomas J. Perrelli and cooperate with his recommendations.

1 Dated: November 18, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

2
3 By: /s/ Renee D. Smith

By: /s/ Sarah R. London

4 Renee D. Smith (*pro hac vice*)
5 James F. Hurst (*pro hac vice*)
6 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
7 300 N. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2310

Sarah R. London
**LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN**
275 Battery Street, Fl. 29
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 956-1000

8
9 By: /s/ Peter A. Farrell

By: /s/ Dena C. Sharp

10 Peter A. Farrell (*pro hac vice*)
11 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
12 1301 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 389-5959

Dena C. Sharp
GIRARD SHARP LLP
601 California St., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 981-4800

13
14 By: /s/ Gregory P. Stone

By: /s/ Dean Kawamoto

15 Gregory P Stone, SBN 78329
16 Bethany W. Kristovich, SBN 241891
17 **MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**
18 350 South Grand Avenue
Fiftieth Floor
19 Los Angeles, California 90071-3426
20 Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Dean Kawamoto
KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
1201 Third Ave., Ste. 3200
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 623-1900

21 *Attorneys for Defendant Juul Labs, Inc.*

By: /s/ Ellen Relkin

22 Ellen Relkin
23 **WEITZ & LUXENBERG**
24 700 Broadway
25 New York, NY 10003
26 Telephone: (212) 558-5500

Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

By: /s/ John C. Massaro

**ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER
LLP**

John C. Massaro (admitted pro hac vice)
Jason A. Ross (admitted pro hac vice)
601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 942-5000
Facsimile: (202) 942-5999
john.massaro@arnoldporter.com
Jason.ross@arnoldporter.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Altria Group, Inc.
and Philip Morris USA Inc.*

By: /s/ Eugene Illovsky

BOERSCH & ILLOVSKY LLP

Eugene Illovsky
Martha Boersch
Matthew Dirkes
1611 Telegraph Ave., Suite 806
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (415) 500-6643
eugene@boersch-illovsky.com
martha@boersch-illovsky.com
matt@boersch-illovsky.com

Attorneys for Defendant Adam Bowen

By: /s/ James Kramer
**ORRICK HERRINGTON &
SUTCLIFFE LLP**

James Kramer
James Thompson
Walt Brown
The Orrick Building
405 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669
Telephone: (415) 773-5700
jthompson@orrick.com
jkramer@orrick.com
wbrown@orrick.com

Attorneys for Defendant James Monsees

By: /s/ Michael J. Guzman

**KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL &
FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.**

Mark C. Hansen
Michael J. Guzman
David L. Schwartz
Sumner Square, 1615 M St., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 326-7910
mguzman@kellogghansen.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Nicholas Pritzker,
Riaz Valani, and Hoyoung Huh*

By: /s/ Mitchell B. Malachowski

TYSON & MENDES, LLP

James E. Sell
 Mitchell B. Malachowski
 Stephen Budica
 April M. Cristal
 523 4th Street, Suite 100
 San Rafael, CA 94901
 Telephone: (628) 253-5070
 jsell@tysonmendes.com
 mmalachowski@tysonmendes.com
 sbudica@tysonmendes.com
 acristal@tysonmendes.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Mother Murphy's
 Labs, Inc., and Alternative Ingredients, I*

By: /s/ Michael L. O'Donnell

WHEELER TRIGG O'DONNELL LLP

Michael L. O'Donnell
 James E. Hooper
 Marissa Ronk
 370 17th Street, Ste. 4500
 Denver, CO 80202
 Telephone: (303) 244-1850
 Odonnell@wtotrial.com
 hooper@wtotrial.com
 Ronk@wtotrial.com

*Attorneys for Defendant McLane Company,
 Inc.*

By: /s/ David R. Singh

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

David R. Singh
 Bambo Obaro
 201 Redwood Shores Parkway, 6th Floor
 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 Telephone: (650) 802-3083
 david.singh@weil.com
 bambo.obaro@weil.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Core-Mark Holding
 Company, Inc.*

By: /s/ Robert Scher

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Robert Scher
 Peter N. Wang
 Graham D. Welch
 Dyana K. Mardon
 90 Park Avenue
 New York, NY 10016-1314
 Telephone: (212) 682-7474
 Facsimile: (212) 687-2329
 rscher@foley.com
 pwang@foley.com
 gwelch@foley.com
 dmardon@foley.com

*Attorney for Defendants Tobacco
 Technology, Inc., and Eliquitech, Inc.*

By: /s/ Christopher J. Esbrook

ESBROOK LAW LLC

Christopher J. Esbrook
 David F. Pustilnik
 Michael S. Kozlowski
 77 W. Wacker, Suite 4500
 Chicago, IL 60601
 Telephone: (312) 319-7681
 christopher.esbrook@esbrooklaw.com
 david.pustilnik@esbrooklaw.com
 michael.kozlowski@esbrooklaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Eby-Brown
 Company, LLC, Circle K Stores, and 7-
 Eleven, Inc., Speedway, and Walgreen Co.*

1 By: /s/ Donald F. Zimmer, Jr.

2 **KING & SPALDING LLP**

3 Donald F. Zimmer, Jr.
4 Quyen L. Ta
5 Jennifer T. Stewart
6 101 Second Street, Suite 1000
7 San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 318-1200
fzimmer@kslaw.com
qta@kslaw.com
jstewart@kslaw.com

8 *Attorneys for Defendant Walmart Inc.*

9 By: /s/ Charles C. Correll Jr. _____

10 **KING & SPALDING LLP**

11 Andrew T. Bayman (Admitted *pro hac vice*)
12 1180 Peachtree Street, Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30309
Telephone: (404) 572-4600
abayman@kslaw.com

13 and

14 Charles C. Correll, Jr.
15 Matthew J. Blaschke
16 Alessandra M. Givens
17 101 Second Street, Suite 2300
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 318-1200
ccorrell@kslaw.com
mblaschke@kslaw.com
agivens@kslaw.com

19 *Attorneys for Defendant Chevron Corporation*

20
21
22
23
24
25 2061378.4
26
27
28